



GLOBAL PRESS HUB

GPHReviewForm

JournalName:	AsianJournalofResearchinBiosciences
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJORIB_1616
TitleoftheManuscript:	DEGRADATIVECAPABILITYOFMICROBIALCULTURE,CARROTPEELWASTEANDCARBONDOTINREMEDIATIONOFPETROLEUMHYDROCARBONINSOIL
TypeoftheArticle	ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

GeneralguidelineforPeerReviewprocess:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.To knowthe complete guideline forPeer Reviewprocess,reviewersare requestedtovisitthis link:

(<https://globalpresshub.com/index.php/AJORIB/editorial-policy>)

[GPH Review Form](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that an author should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)	<p>The research work is aimed at determining the degradative capability of microbial culture, carrot peel waste and carbon dot in remediation of petroleum hydrocarbon in soil. The study design included the use of Microbial culture (MC), organic (Carbon dot and Carrot peel) amendments in stimulating and remediating the impacted soil. It attempts to establish that biostimulation and bioaugmentation should be adopted for cleaning up a soiled environment as it is a safe, eco-friendly and cost-effective practice.</p> <p>The research set-up is appropriate and the manuscript is sufficiently data-intensive; this has given a reasonable scientific merit and robustness to the study.</p> <p>The title appropriately reflects the nature of the manuscript and is consistent with the subject and rationale of the study.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The abstract is succinct, sufficiently providing the gist, context and content of the paper. All the important results are included in the abstract for other researchers to refer from the appropriate abstract database and corroborate with their findings.</p>	<p>Thanks</p>
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	<p>The manuscript is well-structured with appropriate subsections.</p>	<p>Okay</p>
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The introduction part is optimally theory-based, pertinent and orients the reader positively.</p> <p>The research objectives are moderately clear but the problem statement could be more well-defined, although understandable. Addressing the empirical deficiencies and research gaps could have been more clear and expansive.</p>	<p>Okay</p>

GPHReviewForm

<p>5. Doyouthinkthemanuscriptisscientificallycorrect?</p> <p>6. Arethereferencessufficientandrecent?Ifyouhavesuggestionofadditionalrefer ences,pleasementionin thereviewform.</p> <p><u>(Apartfromabovementioned6points,reviewersarefreetoprovideadditionalsuggestions/com ments)</u></p>	<p>The methodology adopted is reasonable; various information-based parameters like study area, physicochemical analysis, Gas chromatographic analysis, microbiological analysis and statistical analysis are made amply clear.</p> <p>The Results & Discussion section provides satisfactory information about the findings from the present study which is aptly presented through the tables and graphs.</p> <p>The conclusion section in the manuscript suitably provides a concise summary of the key findings, significance, implications and a sense of closure to the study.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct and relevant, it succeeds in translating the benchwork to the scientific content. The research work makes a meaningful contribution to the field and its scientific undertone is strong.</p> <p>Recent pertinent references are included in the body of the text as well as in the Bibliography. The number of references included are majorly from the past decade and are sufficiently incorporated to evaluate the quality and reliability of the data.</p> <p>Compliance: The manuscript is compliant with the aims and scope of the study. Readability: Well-written and readable but can be more grammatically rich Presentability: Properly presented</p> <p>Originality: Fair</p> <p>Depth of research:</p> <p>Good Technical quality: Reasonable</p> <p>Credibility: The manuscript does meet a reasonable standard of quality and credibility.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Revision made</p>
---	---	-----------------------------------

GPHReviewForm

<div>MinorREVISIONcomments</div> <div>1.Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarlycommunications?</div>	<div>The language quality throughout the manuscript is reasonable and suitable forscholarlycommunications;thecontentisclearbuthavesomerandomtypographical error. It is recommended that the manuscript is checked andmadegrammaticallymorecorrect.</div>	
<div>Optional/Generalcomments</div>	<div>This review report presents an unbiased critique of the submitted researchpaper with the advice on its suitability for publication. The manuscript, apartfrom meeting a good standard of quality and credibility, seems relevant to thescientificcommunityatlarge.</div>	<div>Noted</div>

PART 2:

	<div>Reviewer's comment</div>	<div>Author's comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</div>
<div>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</div>	<div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div> <div>NO ETHICAL ISSUES</div>	